



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 09/526,780 | 03/16/2000 | Edward O. Clapper | INTL-0359-P1-US (P7596X) | 1757 |
| 7. | 590 01/15/2002 | | | |
| Timothy N Trop | | | EXAMINER | |
| Trop Pruner & Ste 100 | | | PATEL, NITIN | |
| 8554 Katy Free Houston, TX | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2673 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 01/15/2002 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Gir

| | | | production of the second | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | | 09/526,780 | CLAPPER | | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | Nitin Patel | 2673 | | | | |
| Period fo | The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply | pears on the cover sheet with th | e correspondence address | | | | |
| A SHO THE N - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failur - Any n | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Issions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing digital patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS to cause the application to become ABANDO | e timely filed days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| 1)⊠ | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 | | | | | | |
| 2a) <u></u> ☐ | • 1 | nis action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Dispositi | on of Claims | | | | | | |
| · · | 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | |
| | 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| · · | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | | |
| | ion Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | |
| 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) □ approved b) □ disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | | |
| 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| · - | under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | |
| | | an priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1 | 19(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | | |
| ۵, | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| | 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | |
| 14) 🔲 . | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes | stic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1 | 19(e) (to a provisional application). | | | | |
| i 15)□ | a) The translation of the foreign language p Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes | rovisional application has beer stic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ | n received. 120 and/or 121. | | | | |
| Attachme | | | | | | | |
| 2) Noti | ice of References Cited (PTO-892) ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | 5) Notice of Info | nmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) rmal Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |
| LLC Detent | Tradomark Office | | | | | | |

Art Unit: 2673

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1-7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brusky et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,111,569).

As per claim 1, Brusky teaches a wireless peripheral for a receiver (In abstract): a housing (element 70 In Fig.1);

a keyboard defined on housing (In fig.1 element 70 and In Col.3 lines 12-14); a pair of wireless interface that transmit wireless signals directed at sufficiently spaced angles with respect to one another to enable said receiver to distinguish one of signals from the other of signals (In Col.3 lines 14-25).

As per claim 2, Brusky teaches housing includes a pair of opposed sides, a keyboard being situated on each of sides (In fig.1 element 70).

Art Unit: 2673

As per claim 3, Brusky teaches a wireless interface associated with each if keyboard (In col.3 lines 12-16 and In Col.3 lines 42-44).

As per claim 4, Brusky teaches one of keyboard operates as a remote control unit and the other of keyboards operates as a text entry keyboard (In col.3 lines 33-37 and lines 42-44).

As per claims 5,6 Brusky teaches a controller coupled to interface and qwerty keyboard (In fig.1 and In Col.2 lines 51-57).

As per claim 7, Brusky teaches wireless interfaces are infrared interfaces (In col.3 lines 42-44).

3. Claims 11,12,13,14,17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kimura et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,716).

As per claim 11, Kimura teaches providing at least two modes for a wireless device and selecting one of modes for wireless device based on the orientation of wireless device (In fig.21-23 and In col.15 lines 27-44).

As per claim 12,13,14,17 Kimura teaches a processor based system (In col.5 lines 8-10) and wireless interface are infrared interface (In Fig.22 elements 106 a-c) and with angled sufficiently such only one of signals is detected by receiver (In fig.22, 23 and In Col.15 lines 27-44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2673

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brusky et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,111,569) in view of Kimura et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,716).

As per claims 8-10 Brusky does not specifically teaches interfaces are oriented to generate wireless signal greater than 45 degrees from one another and two different orientations arranged relative to a user in each of orientations a different one of interface is aligned with receiver.

Kimura teaches interfaces are oriented to generate wireless signal greater than 45 degrees from one another and two different orientations arranged relative to a user in each of orientations a different one of interface is aligned with receiver(In col.2 lines 25-35 and In Col.14 lines 60-67 to Col.15 lines 1-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention was made to allow the teaching of Kimura's into the wireless keyboard system of Brusky's because it would have provided a full function remote control system for an entertainment system which may include a TV and a PC or internet access device.

6. Claims 15,16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brusky et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,111,569) in view of Henty (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,156). As per claims 15-16 Brusky does not specifically teach controlling a television receiver and providing a text entry commands in another orientation of device.

Art Unit: 2673

Henty teaches controlling a television receiver and providing a text entry commands in another orientation of device (In fig.1a, 1b, 1c and In Col.3 lines 10-55 and In col.4 lines 6-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention was made to allow the teaching of Henty's multi directional controller into the system of Brusky's system because it would have controlled two device with different signal which would not inadvertently activate the two control device at a same time.

CONCLUSION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nitin Patel whose telephone number is 703-308-7024. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin H Shalwala can be reached on 703-305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-308-9052 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9618.

Nitin Patel Examiner Art Unit 2673

> VIJAY SHANKAR PRIMARY EXAMINER